Washington Sentinel.

EDITED BY
WM. M. OVERTON, CH. MAURICE SMITH,
AND BEVERLEY TUCKER.

CITY OF WASHINGTON.

JUNE 30, 1854.

CONGRESS.

In the Senate yesterday, a bill to establish a line of mail steamers between San Francisco, California, and Shanghai, in China, touching at the Sandwich Islands, and Japan, was debated and ordered to a third reading.

The ten million appropriation bill, to enable the President to execute the third article of the late treaty with Mexico, was passed—yeas 34, nays 6.

Much of the day was spent in executive session.

The House of Representatives passed a bill modifying the rates of postage, and afterwards refused to agree to the Senate's amendment (to a resolution passed by the first named body) proposing an adjournment of Congress from the 17th of July until the 16th of October; the House thus adhering to their original proposition to adjourn *sine die*, on the 14th of August.

SOUTHERN AGGRESSION AND NORTHERN FORBEARANCE—COME LET US REASON TOGETHER.

A stranger in reading some of the northern papers, and in ignorance of the true state of facts, would necessarily infer that the southern or non-slaveholding States, had in the formation of the Union under the Constitution, made solemn compacts and covenants of agreement, relying upon the permanency and sincerity of which the now free States had joined in a confederation or union of the States; and since that time, in the progress of events, the south had become the preponderating power in the national government, having not only the numerical strength to pass any law they pleased, but having the will also, and exercising it, of passing laws aggressive to the rights and interests of the free States.

Could any other inference be drawn from the clamors of northern papers of a sectional character for the last ten or fifteen years? We may surely answer, no other impression could be received.

What are the real facts of the case?

From the date of the Constitution to the present day, the relative strength of the parties has been changing, until the power of the national government rests with the northern or so called free States. As against the north, the south is powerless—it could not of itself vote through any bill whatsoever. In what, then, consists its *aggression* on the north? Which, if any, of the great interests of the north has been an object of sectional dissensions? Not one. Is there any interest at the north which could be, by any act of government oppressed, and similar interests at the south remain uninjured. There is no interest peculiar to the north—if there were, the north in Congress would be a unit, and no aggressive law could be passed.

Which of all the acts of the federal government is aggressive on northern rights or northern interests? No man can point out such a single act—one acting sectionally and exclusively against the north. No act can be passed without some persons, both at the north and south, deeming it to be either partial in its operation or alike injudicious and injurious to all portions of the country. The southern opposition to a high protective tariff has occasioned widespread dissatisfaction against the south. Yet the foes of a high tariff never proposed to take away constitutional rights. They opposed grants of special privileges and bounties to foster a particular class of producers to the injury of agriculture and commerce, and they insisted that the power to raise revenue by duties on imports should no be exercised for other and different purposes.

The fact stands uncontradicted, and cannot be truthfully gainsaid. There exists no act on record showing a sectional aggression by the south on the north.

How stands the matter on the other side?

Has the south ever sought to exclude the north from national domain? Has the south ever sought to place restrictions which should act exclusively to interfere with the citizens of the Union migrating from the free States to the territories with all their property? Has not the south abandoned and surrendered her right to go with certain property into specified portions of the national domain? Has the north ever done so? Does the south make opposition to the admission, accession, or annexation of free States? Never, unless in the case of the State of Maine, while the north refused admission to Missouri. Did not the north, the large portion, require as the price of the admission of Missouri that she should come in at the expense of her slaves? Would not a fair offset to that be, that the south would oppose the admission of any State which would not permit its citizens to hold slaves? Yet she has never done so.

The north, in the case of the Missouri Territory would not permit the *lex loci* to protect slavery there, while, in the case of acquisition from Mexico, a large portion of the north contended that the *lex loci* should exclude slavery.

A portion of the north avows the determination not to allow another slave State to enter the Union. Is that the forbearance of the north? Was the sending of a large majority of northern representatives pledged to attach the Wilmot proviso to all States and Territories to come in, an act of forbearance of the north?

Is the resistance to the fugitive slave law, a law incorporated in the Constitution itself as an essential element of Union, forbearance on the part of the north?

Why is it that the north will not allow its children who go to the territories, and are to form new States, whose interests are to be affected, and who best know what they want—why is it that they are not allowed to act unless it be by an aggression on the south as the condition?

How can the sectionalists of the north reconcile their course towards the south with the condition of affairs at the time of the Union? Then certainly there was no objection to an intimate union with slaveholding States and slaveholding territories. Then the people of the north had no objection to slavery. They had it in their midst. Not only did they not object to the extension of the area on which slavery might exist, but *the north by its votes took good care to multiply the number of slaves*. The north—the sires of the present abolitionists, put into the Constitution a clause to enable them to import large numbers of negro slaves to cover a greater extent of area. They tied up the hands of the federal government for twenty years, that it should not interfere to prevent the unlimited importation of slaves. And, strange to say, we have senators on the floor of Congress, in the noon-day sun, adducing this and other similar facts, as evidence that these fathers of the republic looked forward to the extinction of slavery, and upon this interpretation seeking to exclude the south from the federal domain—to hem them in, to crib, cabin, and confine them within presents bounds, and when the south resists this and this alone, the very vaulted heavens shake with the clamor of southern aggression.

The south does not seek to become a majority, it claims only its natural growth; it does not object to the entrance of free States. It does not object to any portion of the slave States becoming free. It asks nothing which it would withhold from the north. The fanatics say explicitly, the limits of the south must stop where they are, while the north shall expand indefinitely. This is the aggression of the south—this the forbearance of the north.

The north has not only its natural increase, but immigrations of many millions to aid them in the race with the south.

What harm does the south intend to any northern interest? None. No one can show any such purpose. Is it strange that, with the Constitution for its shield and guide, it should seek to participate in the common heritage. The south stands wholly on the defensive. The north buys nothing from the south which the south could not sell elsewhere. But the south does purchase many millions from the north which the north could not sell elsewhere, but which the south could obtain elsewhere. The south furnishes freights for thousands of northern vessels, which could procure freight no where else, while the south without difficulty could procure ships elsewhere. The *profits of slavery go to the north*, they promote every channel of trade and commerce, they aid the support of colleges, and they make the watering places and summer resorts flourish. Where the south reaps one dollar profit from slavery, the north gets two, the very papers which teem with rancorous abuse receive from slavery a portion of their sustenance. Men and bretheren of the north, think of all of these things, and let sober judgment preside.

CONNECTICUT NULLIFICATION.

When Connecticut, the land of steady habits, in her early history enacted her code so darkly, deeply, beautifully *blue*, for the better preservation of purity and virtue, she was prompted by a sacred reverence for the principles of the decalogue. So ready was her obedience, and so broad her construction, that it was not only a crime to covet your neighbor's wife, but almost a misdemeanor to covet your own. But like most virtuosoes, descended from the Surface family, she has failed to extract the true principles of morality from the law; and while virtuously regardful of a part of the commandment, she fails to remember that "we must not covet our neighbor's *servant*."

A bill has recently passed the senate of Connecticut, and there is strong probability of its passage in the house of representatives, the purport, and, indeed, avowed object of which is a nullification of the fugitive-slave law. The absurdity of the law, and the mad raving of these senatorial law-makers, are almost as ridiculous as the real principles of the bill are dangerous. Not content with nullifying one law, it abrogates at least three. Not content with aiming a blow at the Constitution, with radical recklessness, it overthrows established principles of evidence and time-honored proceedings in the administration of justice. Not content with denying justice to the suitors in our federal tribunals, it makes them criminals, and provides for the harshest punishment of those who appeal to those tribunals for their property.

We publish, in another column, this bill as it passed the senate. But, for the benefit of those who do not care to wade through the formal language of legislation, we make a brief analysis of the leading and most odious features of the proposed law.

Every claim for the rendition of a slave under the fugitive slave law, and every *representation* in support of that claim, is declared to be "false and malicious," unless sustained by the testimony of two credible witnesses. The claimant, unless so sustained, is punished by heavy fine and long imprisonment. *The witnesses themselves are liable to the same punishment* for "false and malicious" representation, these terms being construed as harshly towards them as towards the claimant. If the claim is based on record evidence, parol testimony is admitted as primary evidence of the contents of such record.

The effect of such a proceeding must be that no claimant for a slave, however strong the evidence of his claim, will dare to approach the tribunal of his country in Connecticut, with such a punishment held over him. Or if, urged on by desire for his property and by a firm demand for justice, he should be induced to engage in so hazardous an enterprise, he would in vain look for two disinterested persons, who would be so bold as to unite with him. Even if the claim were to be prosecuted before the courts of the Commonwealth of Connecticut, such harsh provisions would effectually prevent any application for justice.

The Hartford *Courant* informs us, however, that the object of the law is to punish severely any attempt to get up a "claim that is not proved to be true." And this wise and is accomplished by hanging *in terrorem* over a witness the threat of fine and imprisonment, if he deposes, not what is not true, but what the infamous provision of the law declares *prima facie* false and malicious.

Not only is this injustice perpetrated towards the innocent applicant for his property, but one of the most sacred principles of evidence is swept away in the insane attempt to deny justice to his claim. Parol testimony is admitted as "primary evidence of the contents of any affidavit, record, or other writing," even though such writing may be in the possession of the claimant or of the officer before whom the case is being tried. The dignity which the law has wisely given to record evidence must yield to the doubtful testimony of a witness whose memory may be at fault, or whose motives may be corrupt.

We consider this clause of the bill as grossly unconstitutional despite the declaration of the *Courant* that "the makers of the bill were careful in the use of language not to interfere with the constitutional requisitions upon the subject. Full faith and credit is not given to the records of another State, when those records may be overthrown by the mere parol testimony of interested witnesses. But the Constitution provides that the laws of Congress may prescribe what effect these records and judicial proceedings to which full force and credit shall be given shall have as evidence. Hence any law of a State which renders null a law of Congress prescribing that effect, is as open a violation of the Constitution as though it were in direct opposition to one of its express provisions. Now the law of Congress approved May 26, 1790, provides that "such faith and credit (shall be) given to them in every court within the United States as they have by *law or usage* in the courts of the State from whence the said records are or shall be taken." (L. U. S. vol. 1, chap. XI.) In all the States of which we have any knowledge, and certainly in a majority of all the States, this record evidence is of superior dignity to parol testimony, which cannot be introduced to rebut it, where the record can be obtained. The conclusion is, therefore, irresistable that the same record introduced into the courts of Connecticut is entitled to like *faith, credit* and *dignity*. Here, then, is another open violation of the Constitution provided by this law.

The whole law presents the most singular interference by State legislation with federal proceedings. It provides that the judicial authorities of Connecticut may prosecute a witness for perjury, whose testimony is given in their courts. Provision is already made by Congress for punishment of such offences arising in the federal courts. The party himself who claims under the law of the United States the protection of his rights in the legally constituted tribunals of the Union, is apprehended, tried, convicted, and imprisoned for no other offence than the assertion of those rights—not by the Federal court, which would have the right to punish him for perjury or malicious prosecution there, but by the State courts which can be legally cognizant of the existence of the case only by the record of the Federal court. It is unworthy of a free government. It is unworthy of a despotism which presents only those offences committed against its own government.

We have thus attempted to show very briefly the absurdity and the danger of this movement in Connecticut. We have attempted to point out the mode in which it not only nullifies the fugitive slave law, but violates the Constitution by denying full faith and credit to the records of another State and the unjustifiable interference of State legislation with the constituted and constitutional authorities of the Union. We yet hope that the popular branch of the Connecticut legislature will awaken to a sense of this injustice and avert a calamity which can only widen the breach between the two sections of our common country.

FOURTH OF JULY.

We are gratified to observe from all sources that more than ordinary preparations are being made to celebrate this revered anniversary. In many of the principal cities, north and south, the municipal authorities have granted appropriations to make the celebration worthy of the day; while the infamous proposition of the fanatics, is scouted with well-deserved contempt and disgust by the law-loving and country-loving citizens of the Union. Well may such men propose to mourn, upon the birth-day of our national freedom and constitutional government. But thanks to the blessings which have flowed from our independence, there are but few who look upon the birth-day of conservative freedom as a disgrace; few who feel the wholesome restraints of law to be a galling chain.

Straws may indicate the direction of the wind. We look to this annual rejoicing of a free people on the day when the heart of a new nation first throbbed with freedom, as a guaranty of their determination to protect her institutions from the insane assaults of blinded fanatics, and mischief-loving demagogues. We delight in these hallowed and time-honored customs. They draw the hearts of the people back to the path from which they may have wandered. They are the political sabbaths which turn the soul from the corroding cares of politics, and from the ill feelings engendered by sectional strife, to the quiet contemplation of their political religion. We extract from the Boston *Post* the following remarks on the subject:

"It would be a most gratifying feature of this year's celebration, if orators would draw their inspirations from revolutionary times—from the times of seventy-six. Then ten years' continued debate and controversy about radical questions in government had contributed both to create a sound public opinion, and to draw forth a race of statesmen who acted as though they were in the presence of immense multitudes of their posterity. All through they did not think of laboring for less than that field which Anglo-Saxon enterprise had cleared and conquered; and their Herculean labor was to reconcile territories of so widely different origin, political sentiments and material interests, as Massachusetts and South Carolina, into a common country. They had a century's experience to teach them that complete local isolations as to local concerns was their only hope of Union. They stipulated for this in the very act by which they authorized a declaration, and it will be found running through their whole great work, rounding off with the formation of the Constitution. Let the coming anniversary be devoted to fostering those attachments that go to make us one country."

AN INGENIOUS THIEF.—On Monday, as a fashionable looking man was examining some fancy boots in a New York store, the proprietor of the establishment saw two thieves stealing shoes from his show case. He immediately rushed out and gave unsuccessful chase, and upon his return, wearied and out of breath, was exceedingly mortified to find that his customer had, during his absence, made off with half a dozen of the best pairs of boots in the shop.

NEWS ITEMS.

THE CROPS.—In Maryland the wheat harvest has come suddenly upon us. The rust within a week or ten days past, has made havoc in the crops, and hastened the time of reaping. A gentleman near Cambridge who expected to realize a crop of 2,500 bushels, informs us that he estimates his loss by the rust at 1,000 bushels—*Cambridge Chronicle, 25th.*

In South Carolina, the Abbeville Banner says the crops in every portion of the district, are the finest that have greeted the eyes of our good planters, in many a long year.

In Florida the indications at present are, that almost a bountiful crop is to reward the toils of the farmers of Florida in the coming harvest. Not for years has the crop been so promising as now.

In Louisiana our planters are complaining of the wet weather and the destruction of the crops. The cane is suffering; the corn and cotton are most a total loss. Grass gaining awfully.—*Opelousas Courier.*

In Texas the crops throughout the State, as a general thing, are in a most flourishing condition. In some places there has been too much rain for cotton, but on the whole abundant crops of all descriptions may be anticipated.

FIENDISH ACT—AN INFERNAL MACHINE.—CINCINNATI, *Tuesday, June 27.*—Last evening a box was sent to the marine hospital, corner of Longworth street and Western-row, and deposited in the room of the steward, Mr. J. H. Allison. About ten o'clock, the steward and his wife being alone in the room, opened the box, when it exploded with terrific force, mangling the bodies of both in a horrible manner. Mrs. Allison had both her arms blown off and her skull fractured, while Mr. A. was dreadfully mangled. The furniture, windows, ceiling of the room, &c., were shattered to atoms. The indications are, that the box contained a bomb-shell of about six inches in diameter. No clue has yet been discovered of the perpetrator of this hellish act.

A second dispatch says the Allisons are dead. Mr. A. made a statement before his death, which, with the information obtained to-day, will probably lead to the detection of the guilty parties. It is said that a fellow named Conwell committed a murder some time since, and that Allison was acquainted with the facts, consequently it is supposed that Conwell desired to take Allison's life. The description given by the latter of Conwell, answers that given by the boy who delivered the box, of the person from whom he received it.

A BLOOMER AFTER A LOVER.—We saw a sight in this city of sights last Friday. It was a young lady possessing beautiful features. Her eyes glistened and glowed with intense brightness; her cheeks were flushed as the rose, and her lips bore the resemblance of red cherries, freshly plucked from the trees. Her costume was of black velvet. She was dressed *a la* bloomer—only a little more so. Her pants came to the ancles, where they were buckeled neatly around a pair of white stockings. She had a black mantle thrown over her shoulders, and on the top of her head sat very becomingly a black beaver hat. Her hair was combed beautifully on each side of her forehead, and fell in ringlets on her shoulders. She is about eighteen years of age, hails from Philadelphia, and is now on her way to New Orleans in search of a runaway *lover*—*Daton Empire.*

TEN THOUSAND DOLLAR TROTTING MATCH.—At the conclusion of the recent races on the Long Island course, two young gentlemen who take an interest in turf matters, came in collision and a match for $10,000 between two celebrated horses was made, to come off on the 7th of July next, at the Centreville course. The match is for $5,000 each, mile heats—best three in five, and the steeds named are *Highland Maid* and *Grey Eddy*. From the character of these horses there is no doubt but the contest will equal anything in that line.

Nullification in Connecticut.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *June 26, 1854.*

To the Editor of the New York Herald:

The following infamous nullification law has been reported by the judiciary committee to the general assembly, and has passed the senate, (every democrat voting against it, however,) and will undoubtedly pass the house. It is openly avowed by Mr. Harrison, (senator fourth district,) who drafted it, that its object is to render the fugitive slave law "null and void" in Connecticut. Will the people of Connecticut sustain such legislation? I trow not.

AN ACT FOR THE DEFENCE OF LIBERTY IN THIS STATE.

SEC. 1. *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened*, Every person who shall falsely and maliciously claim, declare, represent, or pretend, in presence of any judge, commissioner, marshal, or other officer of the United States, that any other person is a slave, or owes service or labor to any person or persons, with intent to procure, or to aid or assist in procuring, the forcible removal of such other person from this State, shall pay a fine of five thousand dollars, and be imprisoned five years in the Connecticut State prison.

SEC. 2. Every claim, declaration, pretense, or representation, that any person being or having been in this State, is or was a slave, or owes or did owe service or labor to any other person or persons, shall be deemed, in all cases arising under this act, to be *prima facie* false and malicious; and the truth of any such claim, declaration, pretense, or representation, shall not be deemed proved except by the testimony of at least two credible witnesses testifying to facts directly tending to establish the truth of such claim, declaration, pretense, or representation, or by testimony equivalent thereto.

SEC. 3. If, upon the trial of any prosecution arising under this act, the prosecuting officer shall claim that such false claim, declaration, representation, or pretense, was made wholly or in part by means of any affidavit, record, or other writing, parol evidence of the substance of such affidavit, record, or other writing, shall be admissable as primary evidence of its contents.

SEC. 4. Upon the trial of any prosecution arising under this act, no deposition shall be admitted as evidence of the truth of any statement in such deposition contained.

SEC. 5. If, upon the trial of any prosecution arising under this act, any witness shall, in behalf of the party accused, and with intent to aid him in his defence, falsely and wilfully, in testifying, represent, or pretend, that any person is or was a slave, or does or did owe service or labor to any other person, such witness shall pay a fine of five thousand dollars, and be imprisoned five years in the Connecticut State prison.

SEC. 6. Whenever complaint or information shall be made against any person for any offence described in any section of this act, and upon such complaint or information a warrant shall have been duly issued for the arrest of such person, any person who shall hinder or obstruct a sheriff, deputy sheriff, or constable, in the service of such warrant, or shall aid such accused person in escaping from the pursuit of such officer, shall be imprisoned one year in the Connecticut State prison.

SEC. 7. No claim, declaration, pretense, or representation that any person is or was an apprentice for a fixed term of years, or owes or did owe service merely as such an apprentice for such fixed term, shall be deemed prohibited by any of the provisions of this act, but no such claim, declaration, pretense, or representation that any person is or was such an apprentice for such fixed term, or owes or did owe service merely as such an apprentice for such fixed term, shall render any person liable to any penalty under this act.

Duelling in California.

(Extracted from a California paper.)

Three duels have been fought during the last two weeks, two of which have terminated fatally. The first took place on the morning of the 21st, between Numa Hubert, late member of the assembly from this city, and George T. Hunt—weapons duelling pistols at twelve paces. At the third fire Mr. Hunt fell, mortally wounded, and died in a few hours.

On the morning of the 24th, Thomas L. Benson and —— Mengis, two stevadores of our city, fought with colt's revolvers, and at the second fire Mr. Benson was shot through the body. He died the next day. Another duel is reported to have occurred on yesterday morning, in which one of the parties was wounded in the shoulder. Names not known.

C. Dowdigan and J. Hawkins fought a duel on the morning of the 19th May, near the city; weapons, rifles, at forty paces. At the second fire Mr. Dowdigan was slightly wounded in the fleshy part of the arm, and the difficulty was adjusted.

The duel between Messrs. Benson and Mengis seems to have been a most disgraceful assassination. The San Francisco *Sun* contains the following notice of it:

It appears that the parties had been connected in business, and having quarreled, a challenge was sent by one of the parties to fight a duel with revolvers, which was accepted, and seconds appointed to make the necessary arrangements, who agreed that the fight should come off at seven o'clock in the morning, at the above place. The challenged party and his friends were on the ground at the appointed time, and after waiting an hour and a half without the appearance of the opposite parties, concluded to retire. After having gone some four miles, however, they met the other principal and his second a-foot, making for the ground as fast as they could, having walked all the way from the city, a distance of some eight or ten miles. The whole party then retraced their steps, and after the preliminaries had been adjusted and the ground selected by the seconds, the principals took their positions at twelve paces. No arrangement, it seems, had been made by the seconds about the size of the weapons, one of the parties being armed with a large navy or dragoon pistol, while the other had one of the smallest calibre of pocket pistols, that would hardly carry 12 paces against the strong wind that was blowing at the time, directly in the face of him who held it, and who appeared to be totally ignorant of the use of the weapon.

On the word being given to fire, the small pistol snapped but did not go off. At the second fire the man with the small pistol was again behind time, and before he could get his weapon ready the ball of his adversary had taken effect in the arm pit, when he staggered and fell. A person calling himself a surgeon, was present, but not having any instruments, it was impossible to ascertain the depth of the wound. In this condition the victim was allowed to remain on the ground, being without a conveyance, and would in all probability have been left to die, as he was unable to move without assistance—even his second having deserted him—had it not been for two gentlemen who rode forward, and induced the second of the victor to give him a place in his carriage, in which he was brought to the city. The whole affair was a murderous farce; the parties connected with it being evidently ignorant of the use of the weapons with which they fought, and were only the deluded mimics of those whom they looked upon as their superiors.

From the Albany Atlas.

Strange Suicide.

Last week we published the account of the suicide of William Pierce, as related to the *Express* by Deputy Sheriff St. John. We have received the following account of the transaction from Mr. Falk, together with a copy of a confession made by the deceased before committing the deed, attached.

PRESTON HOLLOW, *June 22.*

An awful tragedy has just transpired in Preston Hollow, Albany county, New York. The facts are these: On the evening of the 3d of May last, about 11 o'clock, the clothing and wool-carding works, owned and occupied by William Pierce, of this village, were destroyed by fire, valued at about $1,500, on which there was an insurance of $1,000 in the United States Insurance Company of West Potsdam, New York, ending May 6th, 1854. Soon after the fire, and on the 22d day of May last, Mr. Pierce made a statement of the fire and loss, and forwarded it to said company, as directed in his policy. Mr. Pierce, on the 19th instant, worked on the highway, came home about four o'clock in the afternoon, milked his cow, shaved himself, combed his hair, and, about sundown, went to the barn with feed for his hogs, (he had been in the habit of going to his barn to pray,) but staying so long his wife went to learn the cause of his long absence in the barn, and as she opened the door, she beheld her husband hanging by his neck. The alarm was given, the citizens rushed to the spot, and found Mr. Pierce hanging, and his neck dislocated. He was dead. His funeral took place yesterday. His death caused great excitement. He leaves a wife and four children to mourn his loss. Since the funeral, his brother-in-law, in looking over the pocket-book of the deceased, to see if he had given any reason for committing so horrible a deed, discovered a paper on which was the following confession to his family, with a request to his counsel, Lawrence Falk, esq.

Confession.—To my family—I wish to make a confession, *to the world*, that I *fired* my clothing works on the 3d of May, without any of my *family* having any knowledge of the same. And I see the great injustice I have done *myself* and *family* by injuring us all. My desire is that the Almighty would be merciful to you all, and that your neighbors will sympathise with you and comfort you in your suffering, and God have mercy on you, one and all. Life is a burden to me, after having committed so great a crime, and I desire not to live. Oh my children! take warning by this, let nothing tempt you. For the evil one, and your hearts by nature, will lead you astray, therefore ask the Almighty to guide and protect you throughout life. And may God grant you your desire.

June 10, 1854. WILLIAM PIERCE.

I wish Mr. Falk, who is my counsel, to notify the Insurance Company of this, and that they ought not to pay or be prosecuted for the insurance money. WILLIAM PIERCE.

June 15, 1854.

A BEAUTIFUL THOUGHT.—Margaret Fuller somewhere beautifully says: "It is a marvel whence the perfect flower (water lily) derives its loveliness and perfume, springing as it does from the black mud over which the river sleeps, and where lurk the slimy eel and speckled frog, and the mud-turtle, whom continual washing cannot cleanse. It is the very same black mud out of which the yellow lily sucks its obscene life and noisome odor. Thus we see, too, in the world, that some persons assimilate only what is ugly and evil from the same moral circumstances which supply good and beautiful results—the fragrance of celestial power—to the daily life of others."

THE NIAGARA FALLS HYDRAULIC CANAL.—We learn from the Niagara Falls *Gazette* that the canal which was commenced at that place a year since is progressing steadily and as rapidly as an economical plan of operations would seem to justify. There are now about one hundred men employed on the work, exclusive of the "steam Irishman," as Gardener's rock drill has been termed. The force will soon be increased to one hundred and fifty laborers, and it is believed that the entire excavations will be finished during the present year. The whole length of the canal line, as contracted for, is 4,500 feet. Of this, 1,700 is already excavated down to grade. The expenditures thus far have reached $60,000.

From the London Times.

Kossuth at Nottingham.

On the 8th inst., a public meeting was held in the market place at Nottingham for the purpose of hearing M. Kossuth proceed with the exposition of his sentiments with regard to the objects to be obtained by the existing war and the method of conducting it—in continuation of the speeches delivered recently at Sheffield—and for passing popular resolutions thereon. For this purpose, a substantial platform had been erected, which was covered with emblems expressive of sympathy with Poland and Hungary. One of these was a rude map of Poland, quartered—"This was stolen by Russia"—"This was stolen by Austria"—This was stolen by Prussia." being written thereon. M. Kossuth was surrounded by a considerable number of Poles and Hungarians, and other foreigners, and by a large multitude of working-men, but the number of influential inhabitants present was very inconsiderable.

M. Kossuth, having been introduced, commenced by heartily thanking the people of Nottingham for this generous reception, and for the assurances of sympathy they had accorded to him. Your country (he continued) is an asylum for persecuted exiles, whatever may be their political opinions. Why? Just because it is a free and independent country. [Cheers.] If personal security were not inherent to your situation, then you would not be freemen—you yourselves would be dependent, partly upon arbitrary power and partly upon the impertinent pretensions of foreign arrogance. Therefore, the right of asylum is essential to a country's freedom and independence. [Hear, Hear.] I, for one, in my asylum here. have met with many an annoyance from certain quarters, but I have also received many a kindness from the people and from individuals. [Cheers.] For this I have to be thankful and will be all my life. But, from those to whom I gladly owe thankfulness I never have heard the claim, that in return for the right of asylum I have to forswear the sacred duties of patriotism. Quite the contrary. [Cheer.] Those to whom I owe gratitude have honored me with kindness and sympathy, precisely because they found me unwavering in attachment and faithful to my duties to my native land. [Loud cheers.] It is to this I owe the kindness and sympathy with which the people of Nottingham honored me on my first arrival in England, and on the present occasion. It is this appreciation of faithful patriotism which has been, and is, the source of that generous attention and operative succor with which the people of Nottingham have always assisted, and continue to assist, the Polish and Hungarian exiles—a fact to which I desire to bear testimony here, in the face of high Heaven, and to thank you for it publicly, in the name of all my companions in exile, to whom you opened your hospitable doors, and let them rest at your firesides. and gave them work when they were wanting work, and lent them a brother's hand when they were in distress. May our Father in heaven bless you and yours for it! [Cheers.] But it is curious that those from whom I never meet but scorn, persecution, and insult—these come on every occasion whenever I happen to speak a true word which does not suit them precisely, because it is true—they come and charge me that it is unthankfulness on my part, in return for the asylum I enjoy, to say and to do what they don't like. Now, as to this right of asylum, I once for all declare I do not hold it from the favor of any person—I do not hold it as a special privilege, accorded to me particularly—I hold it from the constitution and the laws of England. [Hear, hear.] I hold it from the fact that you desire to be a free and independent nation. In return, I obey your laws and pay my taxes, [hear, hear,] and, upon my soul, they are not over-easy for an exile. [Laughter and cheers.] They are not over-easy for an exile who, having had all the millions under his control, can glory in the fact of having wandered to exile with empty but clean hands. [Applause.] Even so, I never intended to do, knowingly, anything against your laws, but I am firmly resolved to have all my freedom within the limits of your laws, and will never consent to give up one bit of it. [Hear, hear.] I certainly never will acknowledge that the thanks I owe for the right of asylum consist in ceasing to be a good Hungarian, only because some powerful in your country are a little too good Austrians. [Hear.] Now, I will and shall do all I can against Austrian despotism for Hungarian liberty, and liberty in general. [Cheers.] Am I right in this, or am I not? ["Yes."] Well, if I am right, allow me to be true to this determination on the present occasion. Gentlemen, in the war in which you are now engaged, your country has a double aim. The first is to secure Turkey from being absorbed by foreign powers, because that would be very dangerous to the world, and very dangerous to your own country; and, in connexion with this, the second aim is to reduce the dangerous power of Russia. Now gentlemen, in my humble opinion, this object cannot be attained by the policy upon which your government appears to be bent, nor by the means which it employs. The means are insufficient, and the policy, in my opinion, is dangerous, subversive of the very aim of the war, and causing you to pay numerous millions for a result which is contrary to your advantage and your wishes. As to the means, you, of course, understand that neither England nor France can send hundreds of thousands of men so far off by sea. and yet hundreds of thousands of men are required to gain the object for which you went to this war. But you have your fleet, you will say. Yes, you have it; and well may you glory in it; it is the mightiest fleet the world has ever seen, and the brave boys on board of it will bravely answer your immortal Nelson's address, "England expects every man to do his duty." [Cheers.] But then, unfortunately, your fleet cannot swim on the sand plains of Russia; and yet it is on these sand plains that decisive battles have to be fought. Not one battle, but many. [Hear, hear.] These wars cannot be disposed of by a little boxing, however brave. You perhaps may feel somewhat mortified not to hear of some naval exploits from your brave tars; but that will not do, gentlemen. They would fight if they could come to it. The czar just prudently keeps his ships hidden in snug harbors out of the range of your guns. Therefore, all that your brave tars can do is to give "house arrest" to the ships of the czar—to keep them at home [Hear.] That is all. But with this, with a little coast blockade, and with battering down some stones from fortresses, Russia is not to be vanquished. Now, I will tell you, gentlemen, how you can best employ your fleet so as to gain your object. Sign petitions that your government shall permit "Brave Charley," as you call him there, in the Baltic, to land, and make such a Nelson speech to gallant and heroic Poland, as "Rise, boys, and fight! here are some good arms, and some dry powder for you, and here am I to back you." [Loud cheers.] Upon my soul, "Brave Charley" will be glad to do it, and Poland will rise like a hurricane against your enemy, the czar. The inheritors of the ancient glory of Poland will pray to God, and fight and keep their powder dry. [Applause.] Now, gentlemen, that is the best means to make useful your fleet, and the only means of attaining the object of your war. Without Poland fighting, you cannot vanquish the czar—you cannot reduce the dangerous power of Russia. The reconstruction of Poland is your victory, or nothing is. Again, gentlemen, you mean to fight for freedom, do you not? [Yes, yes!] Well, if you do, I will tell you in what way you can best do it. Sign petitions, and call on your government to declare to Turkey that England has no objection to Turkey taking the Hungarian nation for its ally, instead of accepting the treasonable friendship of ambitious Austria, red with the blood of murdered nations. [Cheers.] Have you any objection to see Hungary afforded a better security for resurrection and liberty and greater political safety? [Cries of "No, no!" and three groans for Austria.] If you have no objection to it, neither should your government have, because you are a constitutional people. Your voice has only to be heard, because it is you who have to bleed and pay for war. [Hear, hear,] But, really gentlemen, I believe it is a very moderate wish, when I don't ask more from your government, if it does not mean to do any good to Hungary, at least to do us no harm. It should not help Austria to fetter us. [Hear, hear.] So much we may well claim, gentlemen, because of the positive wrong we experienced from the English government, which, by its consent and encouragement, brought down the Russian intervention upon us in 1849. [Hear, hear.], I protest, before Heaven and earth, that England has no right to do us any harm. [Cheers.] It has no right to dispose of our destinies, by tearing from our lips the blessed opportunity which Divine Providence is affording for our liberation. We are no herd of cattle, to be sold for political expediency—we are a nation. [Cheers.] In the third place, I may well claim so much at your hands, because it so happens that in your present war you cannot prosper if your government ruin us. [Hear, hear.] Our freedom is your victory—our oppression is your defeat. [Hear, hear.] You have a dangerous and laborious way to walk—we have the same way to go; let us go together and we shall both go safely. [Hear, hear.] And yet I am sorry to say, gentlemen, that the policy of our government, up to the present moment, does just to the contrary. It courts the false favors of Austria, it hindered and prevented Turkey from allying herself to Hungary and from affording to Hungary the opportunity to fight for its own liberation and for the security of Turkey. [Hear, hear.] Thus, in reality, you have been made to pay, not so much for the security of Turkey and the independence of Europe, as to secure Austrian oppression over Poland, Hungary, and Italy. [Hear, hear.] Do you like this? [Cries of "No."] No, you do not. You can the less so because England is the loser by it. Austria cannot help you; she must fall, in the long run, in this war. But we — Poland and Hungary — we would. [Cheers.] Austria will betray you; she will stab you unawares. But we will be a strong shield and a sharp sword in your hands. [Cheers.] Now, I ask, will you make English blood to flow? will you pay millions and millions, by shillings and pence, to see them wandering over to the pockets of bankrupt Austria, for the purpose of continuing to oppress Poland, Hungary, and Italy, and at the same time deprive yourselves of the object you have in this war? ["No."] If you would not have this, sign petitions, and declare to your goverament that you mean to fight for freedom, and not for Austrian despotism. Declare to your government that you want to have nations for your allies, and not a bloody, bankrupt usurper. [Cheers.] Declare to your government that you want to take Poland and Hungary by the hand, and not that man whom Lord Aberdeen calls a "magnanimous prince, the young hope of his country," but whom the people of England take to be a despot, a tyrant, a perjurer, and a murderer of whole nations. [Applause.] Let many such petitions be signed, gentlemen, and all will be well. Let my farewell be—a hearty "God bless the people of Nottingham!"

Mr. Mott proposed, and Mr. Renals seconded, and it was unanimously resolved:

"That whereas the war against Russia is undertaken for the sake of supporting the rights and independence of nations against the encroachments of despotic power, this meeting declares that its object will not be attained unless the wrongs caused by the encroachments already made are reduced, and unless some just principles of international law are solemnly laid down for future guidance, and rigidly enforced; and whereas the partitions of Poland have subverted international law to its very foundations, and emboldened Russia to all its subsequent aggressions, at length danger threatens every nation of Europe; this meeting declares that the re-establishment of Poland as an independent nation is not only an act of justice to her sufferings and wrongs, but indispensable for securing the object of the war, for restoring the balance of power in Europe, for putting a stop to the encroachments of Russia, and for re-establing a true and lasting peace."

The Rev. G. A Syme moved, and Mr. James Sweet seconded:

"That whereas the house of Austria, with vile ingratitude, has participated in the spoil of Poland, once her deliverer, and even now reigned in Hungary, not by law of right, but by the aid of a Russian invasion, as unjustifiable as that against which we are now taking up arms; this meeting declares that an alliance with Austria for the present war would be unsound, dangerous, and subversive of its aim; that if the people of England desire to be guarded against the recurrence of wars, brought about by the encroachments of despotism upon the rights and independence of nations, and desire by their present sacrifices to attain a true and lasting peace, they are bound by honor and interest to seek an alliance with the oppressed nations, and not with the oppressors; and whereas the cause of Poland is peculiarly important at this crisis, from the fact that England and France, cojointly with Turkey, are already at war with Russia, the most powerful among the spoliators of Poland; this meeting resolves to present petitions to both houses of Parliament, praying that assistance be afforded to Poland in her efforts to regain her rights, and that the war be not terminated without a treaty of peace recognizing the restoration of Poland to independence and integrity."

Carried unanimously.

A petition to both houses of Parliament, imbodying the resolutions, was unanimously adopted on the motion of Mr. H. Smith, seconded by Mr. T. Marriott.

The proceedings were then adjourned to an evening meeting, to be held in the Mechanics' Hall, and the immense assemblage dispersed, having been occupied from one o'clock until half-past three.

Cheers before separating were given for Kossuth, Hungary, and Poland, and hearty groans for Austria and Russia.